

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-8 are present in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 7 and 8 have been amended. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

At the outset, Applicant extends his appreciation to Examiner Greene for his courtesy in conducting the interview with Applicant's representative on December 18, 2012. During the interview, Applicant's representative discussed distinctions between the invention and the cited Sampson publication. Applicant's representative proposed amendments to the claims in an effort to clarify distinguishing features of the invention. The Examiner agreed that the amendments appeared to overcome the rejections of record, subject to further consideration and an updated search.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,802,499 to Sampson et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Sampson relates to credit support agreements for collateralization between OTC derivative market participants. The Sampson system is constantly moving assets back and forth between participants to cover outstanding credit exposures. As discussed during the interview, an important distinction between Sampson and the invention is that the "assets" in the consumer funding account of the invention are not "moved" when an amount in the account is held or reserved. The Office Action refers to an omnibus account described in Sampson, but this account is like an escrow account for everyone's assets, and the assets are still moved to and from the omnibus account as the transactions evolve. See, for example, col. 1, lines 6-10; col. 3, lines 12-15; col. 9, lines 20-25; etc. In contrast, claim 1, for example, has been amended to recite that the reserving step is practiced without the participant providing the funds or any instrument of the funds to the vendor and without transferring the funds or any instrument of the funds from the consumer funding account. Independent claims 4, 7 and 8 have been similarly amended, and Applicant submits that the rejection is thus misplaced.

With regard to the dependent claims, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable independent claim.

Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable over the art of record and that the application is in condition for

UNDERSTEIN  
Appl. No. 09/617,065  
January 7, 2013

allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Prompt passage to issuance is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, in the fee(s) filed, or asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to Deposit Account No. 14-1140.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:           /Alan M. Kagen/            
          Alan M. Kagen  
          Reg. No. 36,178

AMK:jls  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100